

ITEMS

VOLUME 3 . NUMBER 1 . MARCH 1949
230 PARK AVENUE . NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

"STUDIES IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY IN WORLD WAR II": THE WORK OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT'S RESEARCH BRANCH, INFORMATION AND EDUCATION DIVISION

THE first two volumes, entitled *The American Soldier*, of a four volume work on *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II* are announced by the Princeton University Press for publication early in May.

These volumes are produced under the auspices of a special committee of the Social Science Research Council, comprising Frederick Osborn (chairman), Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Leland C. DeVinney, Carl I. Hovland, John M. Russell, and Samuel A. Stouffer.

The research on which the publications are based was carried on in the Research Branch, Information and Education Division of the War Department. It involved study of the attitudes of more than half a million soldiers, in the United States and overseas. After the War, the Social Science Research Council obtained the release of the basic data for further analysis and presentation to the social science professions. Funds for carrying out the work were granted to the Council by the Committee of Trustees on Experimental Programs associated with the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation, and by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Security restrictions were removed on classified reports based on more than 200 separate research studies and the original IBM punched cards and code books were supplied to the editorial subcommittee: Samuel A. Stouffer (chairman), Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Leland C. DeVinney, and Carl I. Hovland.

Volume I, *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life*, analyzes a wide variety of problems of the Army as a social institution and of the adaptation of men to the requirements of military life.

Volume II, *The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath*, deals with the sociological and psychological factors involved in behavior under stress, and also ana-

lyzes special problems arising with the end of hostilities.

Volume III, *Experiments on Mass Communication*, scheduled for publication this summer, is an analysis of the logic of controlled experimentation in social psychology, as exemplified by a large number of experiments in influencing the minds of men through motion pictures and radio.

Volume IV, *Measurement and Prediction*, scheduled for early fall publication, funds the experience of the Research Branch in developing and using new theories of socio-psychological measurement and in predicting future behavior.

The present discussion is limited to Volumes I and II. These volumes, unlike Volumes III and IV, are primarily substantive rather than methodological. Nevertheless, they provide an exemplification of the application of new and old techniques to a very large variety of problems and are expected to be of considerable interest to social research technicians and to teachers seeking illustrative examples of technical operations.

The main objectives of Volumes I and II are to enhance our body of knowledge, both theoretical and empirical, about social behavior.

In Volume I, Chapter 1, the work of the Research Branch is described and the point of view of the volumes, in the context of social science, is elaborated. After reviewing some of the thinking of the past which has converged to make up the general orientation of the volumes, the authors write:

The chapters are not organized around any single conceptual scheme. To do that, in the present state of the knowledge of social psychology and sociology, would be as sterile as, say, it would have been to organize data in medicine a century ago around a

theory of convulsive action as advanced by Dr. Benjamin Rush. We know now that not one overarching conceptual scheme but rather many limited conceptual schemes were to open the road to progress in medicine. A germ theory of disease was to be useful for one class of phenomena, a deficiency theory for another, still other theories for others. In the present state of the social sciences, it is imperative that we keep an open mind with respect to the potential utility of conceptual models which have not been subjected to the kind of rigorous verification which we can expect social scientists of the next generation to demand.

Conscious of their obligation to present Research Branch findings in a form which will maximize their utility in the future, the authors . . . have adopted a compromise position with respect to introduction of explicit conceptualization. On the one hand, these reports are not conventional chapters of history. On the other hand, while theory is used both explicitly and implicitly, the data have not been selected merely because of their relevance to some general proposition now current in the psychological or sociological literature. Where the problem area is one which can be expected to concern social scientists in the future, a considerable body of factual data has often been introduced, even if the data are in no sense definitive in resolving conflict between alternative hypotheses which might now be advanced or even if the data do not seem relevant to any current hypothesis.¹

In the chapters which follow, illustrated by several hundred charts and tables, and textually as compact as the authors could make it, is a portrayal of the Army and its impact on men.

The Army is viewed as a social institution, contrasting in some ways with civilian institutions, although the differences are often differences of degree rather than kind. Thus it has an authoritarian organization, demanding rigid obedience; a highly stratified social system, in which hierarchies of deference are formally and minutely established by official regulation, subject to penalties for infraction, on and off duty; an emphasis on traditional ways of doing things which discourages initiative. Like other social institutions it has its informal as well as formal codes of behavior. The mobilization of informal social controls, in combat and in garrison duty and training, is an important object of study.

In the general analysis of how personal adjustment varied in the Army, an immense amount of data from scores of surveys all over the world is consolidated in a relatively small number of tables. One table alone, at the end of Chapter 5, is based on an analysis of the differences between 8,554 *pairs* of percentages, each pair based on samples of men matched on 6 characteristics!

Verbal behavior of the men, as manifested in responses to questions on attitudes, is compared with nonverbal behavior reflecting adjustment in the Army—such as success in the Army as represented by promotions, or failure as represented by isolation in the guard-house or in the hospital psychoneurotic ward. The correspondence between verbal behavior and nonverbal behavior is high enough to indicate that the attitudes supposedly reflecting adjustment are important in the sense that they are related to other behavior reflecting adjustment. But this relationship is only half the story. The other half is that attitudes reflecting adjustment, though all positively correlated with nonverbal behavior, represent *profiles* which vary (a) with the personal background characteristics of the individual soldier, such as education, age, and marital condition; and (b) with various factors in Army experience, such as his branch of service, whether he was overseas, how long he was in the Army, and at what stage of the War his attitudes were studied. To illustrate: personal esprit, personal commitment, status-satisfaction, and general approval of the Army, as revealed in attitudes, are each positively correlated with objective indices of success or failure in the Army. Education is also positively correlated with these indices. But education is positively correlated with attitudes reflecting personal esprit and personal commitment, and negatively correlated with those reflecting status-satisfaction and general approval of the Army. The concept of *varying profiles* may, the authors think, be important for social psychology.

Other conceptual tools, notably a theory of *relative deprivation*, also are introduced to help in more generally ordering a somewhat remarkable body of otherwise disparate findings.

One of the most interesting illustrations of the relationship between verbal and nonverbal behavior is a study reported in Volume II, Chapter 1 of the attitudes of 12,295 enlisted men in 108 rifle companies and 34 heavy weapons companies prior to the invasion of Normandy. It was possible to compare their attitudes *before* combat with *subsequent* performance in Normandy as measured by nonbattle casualties, many of which were psychogenic. Careful statistical analysis shows that within a given regiment, the three companies with the worst attitudes before combat had, on the average, more than 50 percent higher nonbattle casualties than did the three companies with the better attitudes. A companion study, based on individual ratings of men in combat by platoon leaders, showed that the men with the better attitudes before combat also were judged to have made the best record in combat.

The Army status system and reactions of officers and men to it are studied in special detail. An ambivalence,

¹ Vol. I, pp. 32-33.

involving profound dislike of a system of privilege which is alien to the democratic mores of our civilian society (except for some minority groups) and at the same time involving a desire to use the system to acquire status, is manifested throughout the data.

In the description of problems of leadership, it turns out that the antagonism to officers, though endemic, was least among combat troops and greatest among troops in inactive overseas theatres or the rear areas of active theatres. The theory of relative deprivation helps show how such a finding is related to the extent to which officers and enlisted men shared the same discomforts and dangers.

The analysis of problems of job assignment and job satisfaction reveals many parallels with problems in civilian industry. World War I taught the importance of taking account of *aptitudes*. If the implications of these volumes from World War II are fully realized, an additional impetus will be given to the importance of taking account of *attitudes* as well.

Because the Research Branch was part of the Information and Education Division, which was responsible for trying to stiffen the ideological supports of the men, the role of ideology in World War II was studied in special detail. It perhaps comes as no surprise to learn, although the picture is a complicated one, how relatively impervious were our soldiers to attempts to describe the War in terms of positive goals. There was only one answer to Pearl Harbor, and there was no defeatism, but the conflict was not viewed as a war to end war or as a crusade for democracy. The failure to recover from the disillusionment of World War I, combined with distrust of some of our Allies—notably Russia—comes in for careful study. Moreover, the chapters on combat show that the closer the contact with the enemy, in either hemisphere, the less rather than the greater was hatred or vindictiveness.

Over a hundred pages are devoted to an analysis of race problems in the Army. A number of myths are dissolved by these studies, for example, the idea, quite commonly held by white officers, that the Negro soldiers preferred white officers. Only 4 percent of the Northern Negroes and 6 percent of the Southern Negroes said they did. Or the idea, often advanced by Southerners, that Negroes preferred Southern white officers to Northern white officers. Only 1 percent of the Northern Negroes and 4 percent of the Southern Negroes did. Or take the idea, firmly held, that white soldiers would never tolerate Negroes in the same company. Mixing Negro platoons into white companies was actually tried out in combat in Europe. Only 7 percent of the white soldiers in these mixed outfits disliked the idea after they had had experience with their Negro comrades in

combat, but two thirds said they had disliked the idea at the beginning. It is significant that almost exactly this same proportion (two thirds) of white combat troops in divisions without such mixed companies said they would dislike trying the experiment in their outfits.

The Negro, it is shown, had mixed feelings about the War. He was less likely than the white to consider the War his affair; but many Negroes, and especially the most racially militant, saw in the War a chance to stake a claim for better treatment afterward. Hence, the racially militant were the most zealous to make a good showing in the Army.

There are many paradoxes in this study of Negro attitudes. For example, Northern Negroes stationed in the South, while disturbed by Jim Crow practices, were as well adjusted as or better adjusted than Negroes stationed in the North. This surprising finding makes sense, however, when it is noted that *relative* to Negro civilians in the South the Negro in uniform was very well situated; the opposite was true in many instances in the North, where he could compare his lot with that of friends earning "big money" in war industry.

More new data bearing on America's race problem are assembled in these volumes than in perhaps any book since Myrdal's *An American Dilemma*.

A total of eight chapters in Volume II is devoted to an analysis of social and psychological factors relating to combat—on the ground and in the air. No attempt will be made here to review systematically the manifold problems treated: combat motivations, effect of length of combat on attitudes, what kind of men stood up best, the control of fear and anxiety, etc.

The kind of material on combat can be illustrated from Volume II, Chapter 6, on "The Combat Replacement." Here it is possible to compare three types of men, namely, seasoned battle veterans, new replacements in veteran companies, and men in combat divisions which had not seen combat. How the new replacements quickly took on the attitudes of the veterans, to whom they looked up—both the cynicism and the pride, often bitter pride, of the veteran—is vividly illustrated. Also, in important respects, the replacements are shown to have been responding to the different situation that they faced. To them, for example, combat-tested leaders carried greater prestige than their fellow veterans would grant them, and the replacements surpassed veterans and men in new divisions alike in their acceptance of Army requirements. This chapter shows, too, that not only did attitudes deteriorate after a few months of combat but, contrary to the view widely held by the top command, combat efficiency also deteriorated. Such findings as these were to have a bearing on controversies accompanying the adoption

of the point system establishing the order of demobilization in the Army.

The point system was actually invented by the Research Branch and "sold" to the Army on the basis of attitude studies made in all parts of the world. The inside story of the point system and the struggle for its adoption is told for the first time:

In planning for demobilization, the Army faced a problem unprecedented in American history.

With the defeat of Germany, it would be possible to release several million soldiers. . . . Prudence required the assumption that another year or more might elapse before the capitulation of Japan. . . .

To keep all men in the service was both unnecessary and politically unthinkable. Some would have to be discharged. Who should these men be?²

The idea of a point system for demobilization . . . [in terms of what the soldiers themselves wanted, was] accepted by the War Department . . . Representative samples of men throughout the world were queried and from their responses the variables of length of service, overseas duty, combat duty, and parenthood emerged as most significant. . . . Studies of reactions to the point system showed that the response to it was remarkably favorable, except among minorities who felt they were personally most disadvantaged by it—and the response to the idea of the point system remained predominantly favorable even after many men became angered by the alleged slowness of demobilization. The point system established the order, not the rate, of demobilization. While some men eventually confused the two ideas, the majority, though hostile to many if not most Army policies, continued to approve the point system.³

In view of the explosive tensions in the early demobilization period, it has been suggested, history may eventually record that the establishment of an objective system for order of demobilization whose justice was accepted by most men may have saved the country from what could have been a crisis seriously damaging to American prestige.

The Research Branch was, of course, engaged in an engineering operation and its contributions to social science as funded in these volumes are a by-product rather than the main objective of its wartime activity. The point system was only one of many achievements of the Branch, though it perhaps was the best known. Most of its studies were directed at local specific problems. For example, what led men in the Southern Pacific not to use atabrine as regularly as the Army thought they should; what attitudes and practices which might be correctible enhanced the likelihood of getting trench

foot; which of two kinds of huts did men prefer in Alaska; what were the preferences for winter clothing among front-line troops in Belgium, Luxemburg, and Germany; what kind of radio programs did men prefer; what did they like to read in *Yank* magazine; what was the laundry situation in Panama; what were the attitudes toward Chinese among troops in India-Burma? These were a few among many topics about which studies were requested.

Sometimes the studies required not only factual data but also predictions as to the future. One chapter in Volume II reproduces in full a memorandum written months before VE day by the Research Branch on morale problems among troops in Germany after it was occupied. The predictions are compared, point for point, with factual data obtained afterward from the occupying soldiers. Another chapter in Volume II tells of the soldiers' plans for their future upon discharge. It was a Research Branch survey, made as early as 1943, which formed the basis for calculating the educational costs of the GI bill being drawn by a special presidential committee. Comparisons are shown of predictions of soldiers' plans with what the same men actually were doing several months after discharge from the Army.

The Research Branch worked closely with many other agencies of the Army—with none more closely than with the Psychiatric Division of the Office of the Surgeon General. Out of this liaison came many studies, including, toward the end of the War, a psychiatric inventory which was employed routinely in all the induction stations of the United States.

These volumes are frank, not only in revealing the Army's shortcomings, but also in pointing out explicit shortcomings of the research. In Volume I, Chapter 1 appear these words:

The social psychologists and sociologists who studied problems of motivation and social adjustment in World War II have an obligation . . . to report on their studies and thus to speed up the process of development of the science of man. Science, unlike art or literature, is cumulative, in the sense that *a scientific achievement is most successful when it stimulates others to make the concepts and techniques it has used look crude and become obsolete as rapidly as possible*. In this spirit the present volumes have been prepared.⁴

The authors of Volume I are Samuel A. Stouffer, Edward A. Suchman, Leland C. DeVinney, Shirley A. Star, and Robin M. Williams, Jr. Stouffer, Star, and Williams are also authors of Volume II, with Arthur A. Lumsdaine, Marion Harper Lumsdaine, M. Brewster Smith, Irving L. Janis, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr.

² Vol. II, p. 520.

³ Vol. I, p. 7.

⁴ P. 5.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE AND ATOMIC ENERGY

by Pendleton Herring

THE implications of atomic energy development from the social and economic viewpoint have been of continuing concern to the Council. In 1945 a Committee on Social Aspects of Atomic Energy was established by the Council to promote research on the human problems deriving from uses of atomic energy, and several studies were completed under its auspices.¹ Now, with the aid of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Council is preparing to embark upon a second phase of activity in this field: The problem is to determine the approach by which research can advance our understanding of the changes that this new field may hold for our society and our economy.

The Council's present concern is to identify ways of dealing with problems related to atomic energy that will have research significance. Existing methods could be extensively applied in the analysis of public attitudes. If such information was deemed desirable and if funds were available, administrative studies might be feasible providing that full access to the necessary facts could be arranged. Such studies might be useful from the standpoint of public information or helpful with respect to policy formulation. They would probably not break new ground from the standpoint of research. In these terms the firmest basis upon which to build is through developing what might be called the economics of technology. Officials of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission have expressed interest in the Council's approach.

In carrying out their recently completed study of the economic aspects of atomic power, Marschak and his associates at the Cowles Commission were much impressed with the effect of technological change on the course of economic development. The smooth curves of economic growth postulated by economic theory do not sufficiently take into account the sudden changes

that may be brought about by the introduction of greatly improved methods of production resulting from technology. While such phenomena were not the primary focus of attention in this study, the investigators were impressed with the importance of more thorough examination of the role that technology has played in economic growth. This point was emphasized by Marschak at a conference held by the Council on December 4. This conference brought together research men from various disciplines to discuss what the Council might do with respect to planning research on atomic energy and technological change. The group made a variety of very helpful suggestions. It was agreed that studies might be undertaken dealing with labor relations in atomic installations, the disposal of radioactive wastes and community relationships, occupational hazards and the insurance of employees, and the contractual pattern established between the Atomic Energy Commission and industries. Moreover, the conference recognized that there are new and complex relationships between civil and military authorities and between the AEC as an independent commission and the legislative bodies. The problems inhering in such relationships, while difficult, do not pose new research questions from the methodological standpoint. The crucial questions here largely revolve about the availability of qualified research personnel and the willingness of students to concern themselves with matters that at some point might entail security considerations and affect the availability of relevant data.

The more challenging research questions are to be found in working out suitable methods for determining the effects of technological change, particularly from the standpoint of economic research. Here, much might be gained by developing closer working relations between economists and engineers. The latter are familiar with factors that economists must take into account if they are to have adequate data for analysis. The best approach might be worked out by economists who have had engineering training. A preliminary survey discloses a few individuals with this background and the Council is very much interested in hearing of others with similar training. A bridge should be built between competent engineers aware of the implications of engineering advances and economists desirous of bringing into their analyses of economic growth the factual data relating to technological change. In this

¹ *American Opinion on World Affairs in the Atomic Age* by Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. and Sylvia Eberhart (Princeton University Press, 1948) demonstrated the usefulness of attitude measurement in the analysis of opinion concerning the atomic bomb and related questions of its control and international organization. Ansley J. Coale carried out an analysis of *The Problem of Reducing Vulnerability to Atomic Bombs* (Princeton University Press, 1947). A thorough economic analysis of atomic power development by Jacob Marschak and associates, working at the Cowles Commission for Research in Economics, will shortly be ready for publication. These studies constitute admirable examples of the application of existing research techniques to a new and difficult problem.

connection it is important to learn more about relevant work under way in engineering schools as well as about economic research activities that impinge upon technology.

Yale Brozen, Professor of Economics at Northwestern University, has secured a leave of absence for the coming spring and summer terms in order to devote his full time to exploration of this field for the Council. Brozen is trained in both chemical engineering and economics. The economics of technology has been his particular interest for a number of years, and in the fall he will offer a course on the economics of technology at Northwestern for the first time. For the Council he will make a survey of personnel trained in this field and of research in process and prepare an exploratory report of the status of relevant research.

Another phase of the Council's project calls for a survey of research under way in government agencies. For example, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has embarked upon a study of technological progress in comparative terms in a number of different countries. The scope of such work was explored in preliminary fashion at a meeting called by the Council in Washington on February 18. Officials from a dozen different agencies discussed their respective interests in the problem of analyzing technological progress. What is the responsibility of the federal government in financing experimental work on new types of aircraft, not only in the military field but also in commercial aviation? What might be learned from the experience of the Department of Agriculture in the introduction of improved strains, such as hybrid corn, or in the impact of the cotton picker or other improvements in farm machinery? What is known about new sources of energy resulting from extensive dam-building projects or from improvements in mining?

In analyzing the effects of technological advance on any one of these fields very complex problems of economic analysis arise. There are many variables which must be taken into account—those resulting not only from improved engineering devices but also from secondary effects of cost factors and reactions of labor, investors, or management. In undertaking research that involves expensive statistical computations and collecting factual data that are not readily accessible, generous financial support may be necessary and research teams of varied competence required. What is the role of the university research worker, and how can cooperative research relationships with government agencies best be organized? No ready answers are at hand but there seems to be real interest on the part of officials in exploring possibilities. In this wide range of questions the consequences of atomic power development are seen as one component of a larger problem. In building on what we know and can learn with respect to technological change, viewed historically and contemporaneously, we may develop more adequate methods of analysis for dealing with problems that lie in the future. The economics of technology suggests an approach that would provide a sound foundation for research which might later prove of great value in handling some of the questions to be posed by applications of atomic power. Admittedly, these questions are of future rather than of current concern. Experts differ regarding the margin of time upon which we have to operate. Whether the span of time be long or short, an opportunity for improving our tools of analysis lies immediately ahead. This need may be met by more refined work at the level of theory, closer contacts between economists and engineers, the marshalling of relevant data, and greater cooperation between university research workers and government agencies interested in technological change.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

ANALYSIS OF PRE-ELECTION POLLS AND FORECASTS

S. S. Wilks (chairman), Frederick F. Stephan (executive secretary), James P. Baxter, 3rd, Philip M. Hauser, Carl I. Hovland, V. O. Key, Isador Lubin, Frank Stanton, Samuel A. Stouffer; *staff assistants*, Herbert Hyman, Eli Marks, Philip J. McCarthy, Frederick Mosteller, David B. Truman.

Intensive work by committee and staff members resulted in prompt completion of their analysis of the reasons for the failure of the public opinion polling organizations to predict the outcome of the 1948 presidential campaign, and in release of the committee's report to newspapers and

press services on December 27, 1948. Release on this date permitted full discussion of the committee's findings at sessions of the social science associations which were holding their annual meetings during the remainder of the week. The report was distributed in mimeographed form and is reprinted, with minor changes in order of presentation, in the winter issue of the *Public Opinion Quarterly*.

The committee's report will appear in final form with the detailed staff report upon which it was based and which is currently being revised for publication as a Council bulletin in the late spring. The staff report contains results of national and state polls, and analyses of various factors involved in the accuracy of polls, such as sampling and

interviewing methods, voting turnout, the "don't know" vote, and shifts in voting intention. It is hoped that both the findings and the data to be presented in the report will be useful for further research and teaching in the field of public opinion analysis.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), J. M. Clark, Edgar M. Hoover, Wilbert E. Moore, Morris E. Opler, Joseph J. Spengler.

The committee was appointed in January to explore possible directions of empirical research on long-term changes in magnitude and structure of larger social units, such as nations, and regions of the United States. On aspects not yet ready for the planning of empirical studies, the committee is interested in stimulating discussion leading toward formulation of the necessary intellectual framework. In establishing this committee the Council recognized the need for studying the problems and factors in economic growth which involve other social sciences than economics—science and technology, natural resources, efficiency of government and other social mechanisms, and cultural patterns in general. The committee held an organizational meeting on March 4.

ECONOMIC HISTORY

Arthur H. Cole (chairman), Earl J. Hamilton, Herbert Heaton, John G. B. Hutchins, Harold A. Innis, Leland H. Jenks, Edward C. Kirkland, Frederic C. Lane, Robert Warren.

The committee has made a grant to Theodore F. Marburg of Princeton University for completion of his study of entrepreneurship as evidenced in the history of Smith & Griggs, a brass-fabricating enterprise in Waterbury, Connecticut. Mr. Marburg has been carrying on this project in collaboration with a group of scholars at Yale University who are engaged in a broad investigation of entrepreneurial character in the brass-working industry. Two volumes sponsored by the committee are now in press: John W. Cadman, Jr.'s history of the corporation in New Jersey up to 1876, and Louis C. Hunter's study of steamboating on the western rivers. James B. Hedges' first volume on the Brown family of Providence, covering the entrepreneurial operations of the family to about 1795, is nearly ready for printing. As announced in the December issue of *Items* the committee has offered six fellowships in economic history for 1949-50; applications were due on March 1 and awards will be announced shortly.

A. H. C.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

Ralph E. Turner (chairman), S. H. Brockunier (secretary), Eugene N. Anderson, Shepard B. Clough, Thomas C. Cochran, Elmer Ellis, Bert J. Loewenberg.

The committee's plans for investigating concepts in related social sciences capable of application in historical researches

were completed last fall, and a program of conferences with experts in allied fields was arranged. On December 4-5 the committee held consultations with Albert G. Hart of Columbia University on concepts in economics and with Harry Alpert of Queens College on those in sociology. On January 29-30 there were conferences with Elmer E. Schattschneider of Wesleyan University on political science and with Joseph J. Spengler of Duke University on demography. The series was concluded on February 19-20 when the committee conferred with Gardner Murphy and Eugene L. Hartley of the City College of New York on psychology, and with A. L. Kroeber of Columbia University and Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard University on anthropology. Committee members and consulting specialists are drafting interim reports on the concepts discussed as a preliminary step in preparation of a general report.

S. H. B.

HOUSING RESEARCH

Richard U. Ratcliff (chairman), Howard G. Brunsman, Nicholas J. Demerath, Ernest M. Fisher, Robert B. Mitchell, Arthur M. Weimer, Louis Wirth, Coleman Woodbury; staff, Gerald Breese.

During recent meetings at Ann Arbor on January 27-29, the committee supplemented its business sessions with three public meetings arranged jointly with the College of Architecture and Design of the University of Michigan. Twenty persons actively engaged in research on the social science aspects of housing attended and discussed the major problems and obstacles encountered in housing research at universities, and ways in which the committee's program might be of assistance in such research. The response to these discussions has led the committee to arrange a similar program in connection with its next meeting at Chapel Hill, in May.

Three of the research planning memoranda in preparation under the sponsorship of the committee are being critically reviewed by specialists, before final revision for publication. The chairman of the committee and Coleman Woodbury plan to devote considerable time to meeting with West Coast housing research personnel during the month of March. The proceedings of the symposium on "Frontiers of Housing Research," held at Madison in September 1948, were published in the February issue of *Land Economics*.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE

ON COMMUNITY STUDIES

Leonard Bloom (chairman), Allen L. Edwards, William Robinson, Calvin F. Schmid, Eshref Shevky, Robert C. Tryon, Paul Wallin.

A monograph by Eshref Shevky dealing with the measurement of socio-economic variables in contrasting social areas of Los Angeles has just been published. The study reported in this volume is closely related to the current work of the committee.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Clark Kerr (chairman), Paul A. Dodd, Maurice I. Gershenson, Robert D. Gray, William S. Hopkins, John P. Troxell, Edgar L. Warren.

The committee met at the University of California in Los Angeles in conjunction with the Pacific Coast Economic Association's annual meeting, December 30-31. At the latter John P. Troxell acted as chairman of a round table session on labor relations on the West Coast.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON PRICE POLICIES

Leonard A. Doyle (chairman), Joe S. Bain, Ralph Casady, Jr., E. T. Grether, John A. Guthrie, Roy W. Jastram, Vernon A. Mund, Robert B. Pettengill.

Members of the committee took an active part in the sessions of the December meeting of the Pacific Coast Economic Association in Los Angeles. Roy W. Jastram was chairman of a round table discussion of industrial price policies in which Joe S. Bain and Leonard A. Doyle were panel participants. Mr. Doyle presented a paper on aluminum prices in the postwar period.

PUBLIC LIBRARY INQUIRY

Robert D. Leigh (chairman), Ralph A. Beals, J. Frederic Dewhurst, Donald G. Marquis, Mary U. Rothrock, Richard H. Shryock, Malcolm M. Willey; *staff*, Robert D. Leigh, director.

At meetings of the committee held in Williamstown, Massachusetts, last summer and in New York on January 28-29, reports of special studies made for the inquiry by staff members were reviewed in draft form or through oral presentation by the authors, and plans for publication of several of the studies were agreed upon. Drafts of all but one of the reports were completed and submitted to the director in advance of the January meeting. Four reports were finally approved for publication, and a précis of the final general report prepared by the director was reviewed.

Arrangements have been made with the Columbia University Press for publication of the general report of the director and six of the staff reports. Four of these are in press: "The Library's Public" by Bernard Berelson is a study of public library use. "The Information Film," prepared for the inquiry by Gloria Waldron with the cooperation of the Twentieth Century Fund, describes the expanding use of 16mm. nontheatrical films by libraries and other agencies and presents information on selection, handling, and projection of films. "The Book Industry: An Inquiry into Literature and the Market Place" by William Miller is an analysis of trade book publishing. "Government Publications for the Citizen" by James L. McCamy is a critical discussion of the problems of printing and distribution of government documents. Also to be published in the series are: "Public Library Government," an analysis of the development, present practice, and pos-

sible reorganization of the public library as a political institution in America, by Oliver Garceau and C. DeWitt Hardy, which is now being revised for final approval by the committee; and "The Public Librarian," a study of public library professional personnel and personnel administration, by Alice Bryan. At least five other staff reports will be duplicated for distribution to interested persons.

For presentation of its publications to the library profession, the inquiry will be able to take advantage of an unusually favorable schedule of meetings of professional librarians during the summer and fall of 1949. The Summer Institute of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School on August 8-13 is planning to devote its sessions to the reports of the inquiry and to invite the authors to participate with librarians and subject-matter experts in discussion of the reports. Also, each of the seven regional conferences scheduled by the American Library Association for the late summer and fall plans to devote a major portion of its program to consideration and discussion of the inquiry's findings and publications. The director expects to speak at each of these meetings and one or more staff members will be invited to participate.

L. M.

SLAVIC STUDIES

(*Joint with the American Council of Learned Societies*)

Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Ernest J. Simmons (secretary), Percy E. Corbett, Merle Fainsod, Robert J. Kerner, Geroid T. Robinson, S. Harrison Thomson, René Wellek.

From the establishment of the committee in February 1948 one of its principal concerns has been to increase the flow of Soviet materials urgently required for the study of current developments in Soviet policy, domestic and foreign. At its first meeting it discussed in detail the possibility of setting up a digest of the Soviet press and periodicals, which would make readily available a wider range of current information, and recommended urgent steps in this direction.

A weekly *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, published under the auspices of the committee, made its appearance on February 1, and is already becoming recognized as an important source of otherwise inaccessible information, for the use of research workers and analysts. Each issue will contain about 70,000 words, or 80 double-column pages. The material is presented in full translation, in condensed form together with excerpts, or in summary; each type of presentation is plainly indicated, together with date and page references to the original sources. The two most important Soviet papers, *Pravda* and *Izvestiia*, are received by airmail, and their contents are made available about three weeks after publication in Moscow. As a convenient check on the news trends of these two newspapers all their contents are listed, at least by subject. The *Digest* also contains selections from about forty other newspapers and periodicals, covering the fields of industry, transportation, literature, law, economics, political science, agriculture, labor, history, philosophy, and religion. Need-

less to say, the materials are presented as documentary "raw materials," without elaboration or comment, and represent only the views of the original authors, not of the committee or of the two appointing Councils. This new service has met with an enthusiastic response among research institutions, newspapers, and government agencies. Its appearance was noted approvingly by an article in the *New York Times*.

The work of editing the *Digest* is carried on by a staff of five persons, all of whom have worked long and hard hours without complaint to issue the publication on time and to meet its exacting dead lines and high quality. The editorial work is carried on in quarters generously supplied by the American Council of Learned Societies, and the officers of the Council have given every assistance in meeting the problems of launching the enterprise. Initial financial assistance has been supplied by the Council from a fund for the procurement of Soviet materials, granted by the Rockefeller Foundation. The *Digest* has received a substantial number of subscriptions; many more will be needed to make it self-supporting. The basic subscription rate is \$150 to institutions. Universities, colleges, libraries, research centers, and recognized scientific or educational bodies which have entered their institutional subscription may obtain supplementary subscriptions for their own use or for staff members or associates, at the special rate of \$25 per year.

The usefulness of the *Digest* for research workers will be greatly enhanced through the provision of a quarterly index, which will provide a comprehensive guide to Soviet press and periodical material available in English. The first index is already in preparation.

Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: Current Digest of the Soviet Press, 1219 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

P. E. M.

SOCIAL SCIENCE PERIODICALS FOR EUROPE

Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Richard Heindel, Thorsten Sellin.

The program for supplying European educational and research institutions with a more nearly adequate flow of

American periodicals in the social sciences has now passed its half-way mark. Some 2,600 subscriptions to 42 periodicals, all but one for a two-year period, have been entered on behalf of 109 institutions. This program is supported by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation and has been assisted by generous discounts given by many of the publishers of periodicals. With the aid of a number of scholars an extensive list of special research institutions has also been drawn up, and periodicals of special interest to their fields of work have been assigned to them. These additional lists are now being checked against duplication, prior to placing the final orders.

The recipients of the periodicals have responded to this program with great enthusiasm as shown by the following comments: "The periodicals have greatly enlarged our knowledge of American scientific work and are constantly consulted by our faculty and students" (Stockholm). "I have pleasure in acknowledging the receipt of the periodicals . . . and beg to express our appreciation of your good-will and friendship shown us in this way" (Brno). "I have the honor to express to the Social Science Research Council my greatest thankfulness for the just received periodicals . . . as well as for the 1949 subscriptions for our library" (Cra-cow). "Please accept my thanks for this most generous gift which I am sure will be found most useful here. I am reporting the matter to the Curators of the library who will, I am sure, wish to be associated with me in thanking the Council for its generosity" (Reading). "I have the pleasure, then, to present to you the very sincere thanks of the University of Rennes for this gift, which will be particularly useful for the faculty of law and social sciences as well as for the faculty of science . . . Our Library is, indeed, in a very difficult situation and the credits which we have at our disposal would not permit us to place any new subscriptions" (Rennes). This is only a small sample of the numerous expressions of appreciation which have been received in response to the Council's program for providing an improved flow of social science periodicals for our colleagues in Europe. This program is already assisting in opening improved channels of communication in the field of social science training and research.

P. E. M.

PERSONNEL

DIRECTORS OF THE COUNCIL

The seven national social science organizations associated with the Council have designated the following persons to serve as directors of the Council for the three-year term 1949-51:

- Clyde Kluckhohn, Harvard University, by the American Anthropological Association
- George W. Stocking, Vanderbilt University, by the American Economic Association
- Shepard B. Clough, Columbia University, by the American Historical Association

- Arthur W. Macmahon, Columbia University, by the American Political Science Association
- Lyle H. Lanier, New York University, by the American Psychological Association
- Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Cornell University, by the American Sociological Society
- Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago, by the American Statistical Association.

Credentials of these men are scheduled for acceptance by the board of directors of the Council at its spring meeting in New York, April 2-3, 1949.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Social Science Personnel—Fred Eggan (chairman), Donald T. Campbell, Edward P. Hutchinson, Philip E. Mosely, Frank A. Southard, Jr., Paul Webbink, Elbridge Sibley (staff)—met in October and again in January to consider applications for research training fellowships. The appointments made at these two meetings were as follows:

Paul J. Bohannon and Laura A. Bohannon, candidates for D.Phil. in social anthropology, Oxford University, a joint fellowship for ethnographic field study in West Africa, with especial emphasis on social differentiation and political organization.

James M. Burns, Ph.D. in government, Harvard University, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Williams College, for a study of parliamentary government in England during a period of economic and social stress.

Franz Gehrels, candidate for Ph.D. in economics, Stanford University, for a study of British capital exports from 1930 to the postwar period.

Stephen R. Graubard, candidate for Ph.D. in history, Harvard University, for a study of the British Labour Party and its attitude toward the Soviet Union, 1917-40.

Morris L. Haimowitz, candidate for Ph.D. in sociology, University of Chicago, for research on ethnic hostility, displacement, and psychotherapy; the effects of psychotherapy on ethnic hostility.

Gerhard E. Lenski, Jr., candidate for Ph.D. in sociology, Yale University, for an investigation of the relationship between prestige position and economic position in a Connecticut community.

Joseph Lerner, candidate for Ph.D. in economics, Harvard University, for a study of the effect of federal taxation on petroleum production in the United States.

James E. Montgomery, Ph.D. in sociology, Vanderbilt University, Associate Professor of Sociology, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, for post-doctoral research training and field work in community study.

Leopold J. Shapiro, candidate for Ph.D. in sociology, University of Chicago, for research on prediction of behavior from attitude or opinion surveys.

Ulric H. Weil, candidate for Ph.D. in economics, University of California, for research on some economic and statistical aspects of federal income tax evasion.

AREA RESEARCH TRAVEL GRANT

Since making the appointments announced in the last issue of *Items* the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships has awarded an additional travel grant, by mail vote, to:

A. Arthur Schiller, Associate Professor of Law, Columbia University, for travel to Holland and Indonesia for research on law and society in Indonesia.

The members of the committee are Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Cora Du Bois, Merle Fainsod, Robert B. Hall, Thorsten Sellin, Charles Wagley, and Walter L. Wright, Jr. An announcement describing the area research training fellowships and travel grants for research in world areas offered by the Council during 1949 has recently been circulated to institutions and is available to individuals upon request. Inquiries should be addressed to Elbridge Sibley at the Council's Washington office, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

ANNOUNCEMENT

U. S. BOOK EXCHANGE, INC.

A central organization for the international exchange of books, the United States Book Exchange, Inc., began functioning on January 1. The new agency is a private corporation sponsored by ten national library organizations and by the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, the National Research Council, the Social Science Research Council, the Engineers Joint Council, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Library of Congress. It will serve on behalf of university, government, and other libraries as a clearinghouse for both domestic and foreign materials, as well as an informational center for those institutions already possessing satisfactory direct exchange relations.

Long a need of libraries, the centralizing operation of USBE was a logical outgrowth of the postwar activities of the American Book Center for War-Devastated Libraries, Inc., which it succeeds. The latter acted for two and a

half years as a center for the collection of donated books and periodicals from American libraries for war-damaged libraries overseas, shipping a total of a million and a quarter volumes. The American Book Center Corporation voted in September 1947 to turn its assets over to a successor organization which would convert the one-way flow into a two-way operation. This would benefit U. S. libraries by bringing foreign materials in, and at the same time continue and make more specific the aid to foreign libraries.

USBE will receive institutional publications, duplicate periodicals, books, and other printed materials from participating libraries here and abroad; list them; and offer the lists to participants for their choice, in exchange for their contributions. A revolving priority in the issuance of lists will prevent inequities in the receipt of exchange materials and give each institution an equitable opportunity for acquiring needed materials over a period of time.

USBE is planned as a permanent self-supporting agency, with support to come from participating libraries; 154 large American public and university libraries have already pledged their membership to the USBE. Benefits to foreign libraries during the first three years are being underwritten by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

The Executive Director of the organization is Alice Dulany Ball, former Acting Executive Director of the American Book Center for War-Devastated Libraries, Inc. Communications should be addressed to The United States Book Exchange, c/o Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C.

PUBLICATIONS

BOOKS

Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Vol. I, *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life* by S. A. Stouffer, E. A. Suchman, L. C. DeViney, S. A. Star, and R. M. Williams, Jr.; Vol. II, *The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath* by S. A. Stouffer, A. A. Lumsdaine, M. H. Lumsdaine, R. M. Williams, Jr., M. B. Smith, I. L. Janis, S. A. Star, and L. S. Cottrell, Jr. Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Analysis of Experience of Research Branch, Information and Education Division, ASF. Princeton: Princeton University Press, May 1949. Pp. c. 600 each. Vols. I and II together, \$13.50; separately, \$7.50.

Historical Statistics of the United States, 1789-1945. Prepared by the Bureau of the Census with the cooperation of the Committee on Economic History and the Advisory Committee on a Source Book of Historical Statistics. Washington: Government Printing Office, March 1949. Pp. c. 375. \$2.50. Orders should be addressed to the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C.

Workers Wanted: A Study of Employers' Hiring Policies, Preferences, and Practices in New Haven and Charlotte by E. William Noland and E. Wight Bakke. Sponsored by the Committee on Labor Market Research. New York: Harper & Brothers, March 1949. Pp. 244. \$3.00.

Research in Political Science: The Work of the Panels of the Research Committee, American Political Science Association, edited by Ernest S. Griffith. Prepared with the aid of the Council. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948. Pp. 244. \$3.00.

The Labor Force in the United States 1890-1960 by John D. Durand. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1948. Pp. 302. \$2.50.

SSRC BULLETIN AND PAMPHLET SERIES

The Recruitment, Selection, and Training of Social Scientists, Bulletin 58, by Elbridge Sibley. 1948. Pp. 178. \$1.50.

Social Adjustment in Old Age: A Research Planning Report, Bulletin 59, by Otto Pollak with the assistance of Glen Heathers. 1948. Pp. 210. \$1.75.

Area Research and Training: A Conference Report on the Study of World Areas, Pamphlet 6, by Charles Wagley. 1948. Pp. 63. 75 cents.

Demands for Labor: Opportunities for Research. Pamphlet 7, by Dale Yoder. 1948. Pp. 46. 50 cents.

All numbers in the Council's bulletin and pamphlet series are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

MEMORANDA

Memorandum on University Research Programs in the Field of Labor 1949 by the Committee on Labor Market Research. Washington: Social Science Research Council, January 1949. Pp. 58. Photo-offset. Obtainable from the Council's Washington office, 726 Jackson Place, N. W.

Research on Wages: Report of a Conference Held on February 21-22, 1948 at the Littauer Center, Harvard University by Lloyd G. Reynolds. Sponsored by the Committee on Labor Market Research. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1949. Pp. 26. Mimeographed. Obtainable from the New York office of the Council.

CONTENTS OF ITEMS VOLUME I, NOS. 1-4 (1947) AND OF VOLUME 2, NOS. 1-4 (1948)

ARTICLES

Breese, Gerald. *Frontiers of Housing Research: Report on a Symposium*, 2(4):4

Bressler, R. G., Jr. *Agricultural Economics Research in the United Kingdom*, 1(4):8

Burgess, Ernest W. *Research Planning in the Field of Marriage and the Family*, 2(4):1

Crane, Robert T. *In Tribute to Wesley Clair Mitchell*, 2(4):1

Herring, Pendleton. *The Social Sciences in a European Perspective*, 2(3):1

———. *The Social Sciences in Modern Society*, 1(1):2

Holland, Kenneth. *The Fulbright Act*, 2(1):7

Jones, Harold E. *The 1948 Meeting of the Canadian SSRC*, 2(3):7

Klineberg, Otto. *Tensions Affecting International Understanding*, 2(2):5

Leigh, Robert D. *The Public Library Inquiry*, 1(2):5

McCarthy, Philip J. See Stephan, Frederick F.

Mosely, Philip E. *The "Books for Europe" Program*, 1(2):3

Poffenberger, A. T. *The Annual Meeting of the Canadian Social Science Research Council*, 1(3):5

———. *The Work of the Social Science Research Council*, 1(1):1

Sibley, Elbridge. *The Problem of Social Science Personnel: Recruitment or Training?* 1(4):1
 ———. *Recruitment, Selection, and Training of Research Workers*, 1(1):7
 ———. *Study of Support for Individual Research Activities*, 2(4):6
 Stephan, Frederick F. and Philip J. McCarthy. *Studies in Sampling under the Committee on Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes and Consumer Wants*, 1(2):1
 Wagley, Charles. *The Study of World Areas: A Report on the National Conference*, 2(1):1
 Webbink, Paul. *University Organization for Social Science Research*, 2(2):1
 ———. See Young, Donald.
 Young, Donald and Paul Webbink. *Current Problems of Council Concern in Research Organization*, 1(3):1

COMMITTEE BRIEFS, OTHER COMMITTEE REPORTS

Agricultural Marketing Research, 1(1):7; 1(3):7; 1(4):8; 2(1):8
 Analysis of Experience of Research Branch, Information and Education Division, ASF, 1(1):7; 1(4):9
 Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts, 2(4):7
 Area Research Training Fellowships, 2(1):8,11; 2(3):11; 2(4):10
 Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 1(1):8; 1(3):7; 2(1):8
 Economic History, 1(1):8; 1(2):6; 1(3):8; 1(4):9; 2(1):8; 2(2):7,11; 2(3):8; 2(4):7
 Exploratory Committee on a Records Management Center, 2(1):9
 Family Research, 2(2):7; 2(4):1
 Federal Government and Research, 1(1):8
 Government Records and Research, 1(2):7; 1(3):8
 Government Statistics, 1(2):7
 Grants-in-Aid, 1(2):10; 2(2):11
 Historiography, 2(2):7
 Housing Research, 1(2):7; 1(3):8; 1(4):9; 2(1):9; 2(2):8; 2(4):4
 International Exchange of Persons, 2(1):7
 International Relations Research, 2(4):8
 Labor Market Research, 1(1):8; 1(2):7; 1(3):8; 1(4):9; 2(1):9; 2(3):9; 2(4):8
 Latin American Studies, 1(3):9
 Measurement of Opinion, Attitudes and Consumer Wants, 1(2):1; 1(3):9; 1(4):9; 2(1):9; 2(3):9
 Natural Science—Social Science Fellowship Board, 2(3):12
 Organization for Research, 1(1):9; 1(3):9; 2(2):1; 2(4):8
 Pacific Coast Committee on Community Studies, 1(2):8; 2(2):8
 Pacific Coast Committee on Labor Market Research, 1(3):10; 2(1):9; 2(3):10; 2(4):8

Pacific Coast Committee on Price Policies, 1(4):10; 2(3):10
 Pacific Coast Committee on Social Statistics, 2(1):10; 2(2):8; 2(3):10
 Public Library Inquiry, 1(2):5; 1(4):10; 2(1):10; 2(2):8
 Slavic Studies, 2(1):10; 2(2):9; 2(4):9
 Social Adjustment in Old Age, 1(2):8; 1(3):10; 2(1):10
 Social Aspects of Atomic Energy, 1(1):9; 1(2):8
 Social Relations Aspects of International Tensions, 2(2):5
 Social Science Periodicals for Europe, 2(2):9; 2(4):9
 Social Science Personnel, 1(1):10; 1(2):9; 1(4):11; 2(1):11; 2(2):9; 2(3):10; 2(4):9
 Source Book of Historical Statistics, 1(1):9; 1(3):10; 1(4):10
 Southern Regional, 1(2):8, 11
 Techniques for Reducing Group Hostility, 1(1):9; 1(3):10
 War Studies, 1(1):9; 1(2):9; 1(3):10; 2(4):10
 World Area Research, 1(1):10; 1(2):9; 1(3):11; 1(4):10; 2(1):1; 2(4):10

PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

Administration of Fellowships and Grants-in-Aid, 2(3):10
 Area Research Training Fellowships and Travel Grants, 2(1):11; 2(3):11; 2(4):10
 Committee Memberships, 1(2):11; 1(4):11; 2(4):11
 Conference Board, 2(4):11
 Directors of the Council, 1(1):10; 1(2):11; 1(4):11; 2(1):11; 2(4):11
 Economic History Fellowships, 2(2):11
 Grants-in-Aid, 1(2):10; 2(2):11
 Joint Fellowships in the Natural and Social Sciences, 2(3):12
 Officers of the Council, 2(3):12
 Pacific Coast Representative, 1(1):11
 President of the Council, 2(2):9
 Research Training Fellowships, 1(1):10; 1(2):9; 1(4):11; 2(1):11; 2(2):9; 2(3):10
 Southern Grants-in-Aid, 1(2):11

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Area Research Training Fellowships and Travel Grants, 2(1):12
 Economic History Fellowships, 1(4):12; 2(4):12
 Grants-in-Aid, 1(4):12; 2(4):11
 Joint Fellowships in the Natural and Social Sciences, 1(4):12; 2(4):11

PUBLICATIONS

Books and Miscellaneous Reports, 1(2):12; 1(3):11; 2(1):11; 2(2):12; 2(3):12; 2(4):12
 Council Bulletins and Pamphlets, 1(1):12; 1(2):12; 1(3):11; 1(4):12; 2(1):12; 2(2):12; 2(3):12; 2(4):12
 Public Administration Pamphlets, 1(3):11
 Public Administration Reports, 1(2):12
 Social Security Publications, 1(3):12

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, E. W. BURGESS, SHEPARD B. CLOUGH, LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., JOSEPH S. DAVIS, J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FREDERICK S. DUNN, ELMER ELLIS, ROBERT B. HALL, PENDLETON HERRING, CARL I. HOVLAND, WILLARD HURST, HAROLD A. INNIS, ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, CHARLES E. MERRIAM, ROY F. NICHOLS, WILLARD C. OLSON, J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER, FREDERICK OSBORN, ROBERT R. SEARS, JOSEPH J. SPENGLER, BLAIR STEWART, WILLIAM DUNCAN STRONG, WILLARD L. THORP, RALPH W. TYLER, S. S. WILKS, DONALD YOUNG, KIMBALL YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; ELEANOR C. ISBELL, GERALD BREES; JOHN G. TURNBULL; CALVIN W. STILLMAN; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Controller*